

Serial No: 09/829,623

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action dated September 12, 2005. In the Office Action, claims 1, 9 and 23 were objected to, claims 1, 9 and 23 were rejected under 35 USC §112, claims 1-19, 21 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 USC §§ 101 and 103. By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-19 and 21-25 are amended and claims 26-28 are added. Currently pending claims 1-19, 21, 23-25 and 26-28 are believed allowable, with claims 1, 9 and 23 being independent claims.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS:

Claims 1, 9 and 23 were objected because they contained a misspelling of the word "hierarchically". OA, pg. 3. By this amendment, the word "hieratically" has been amended to "hierarchically". The Applicants thank the Examiner for pointing out this typographical error.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §112:

Claims 1, 9 and 23 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. OA, pg. 3.

Claims 1, 9 and 23 were rejected because the phrase "said amount of information content" in each claim lacked antecedent basis. By this amendment, the phrase "said amount of information content" is replaced with the phrase "the number of pages contained therein". These amendment are believed to overcome the antecedent basis rejection.

Claims 1, 9 and 23 were also rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, because "the terms 'information' and/or 'network' renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention." OA, pg. 3. The Examiner refers the Applicants to MPEP 2173.05(d).

The Applicants respectfully submit that the reason why claims 1, 9 and 23 are allegedly indefinite is not apparent. MPEP 2173.05(d) relates to use of examples or preferences in claims. The Applicants submit that claims 1, 9 and 23 do not recite examples or preferences.

Serial No: 09/829,623

Furthermore, the Examiner has not explained, nor is it apparent which portion of the claims is believed to be unclear. The Examiner states "the terms 'information' and/or 'network' renders the claim indefinite." To respond to this rejection, the Applicants must be able to determine if only the term "information" is considered to render the claims indefinite, if only the term "network" is considered to render the claims indefinite, if both terms are believed to render the claims indefinite, or if neither term renders the claim indefinite and only "the limitation(s) following the phrase" are believed indefinite. Thus, the Applicants kindly request that the portion of the claims believed indefinite be particularly identified by the Examiner.

For at least the reasons above the rejections under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, of claims 1, 9 and 23 are believed overcome.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §101:

Claims 1, 9 and 23

Claims 1, 9 and 23 were rejected under 35 USC §101 as allegedly "nothing more than an abstract idea that is not a practical application producing a useful and tangible result." OA, pg. 5.

Claims 1, 9 and 23 provide or output selected intermediate documents. The Applicants submit that providing or outputting selected intermediate documents, produces a useful, real world, tangible result.

For at least the reasons above the rejections under 35 USC §101 of claims 1, 9 and 23 are believed overcome.

Claims 2-8, 17 and 19

Claims 2-8, 17 and 19 are dependent on and further limit claim 1. Since claim 1 is believed allowable, claims 2-8, 17 and 19 are also believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claims 10-15, 18 and 21

Claims 10-15, 18 and 21 are dependent on and further limit claim 9. Since claim 9 is believed allowable, claims 10-15, 18 and 21 are also believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 9.

Serial No: 09/829,623

Claims 24 and 25

Claims 24 and 25 are dependent on and further limit claim 23. Since claim 23 is believed allowable, claims 24 and 25 are also believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 23.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §103:

Claims 1-19, 21 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,275,988 issued to Nagashima et al. ("Nagashima") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,557,007 to Pekowski et al. ("Pekowski"). A *prima facie* case for obviousness can only be made if the combined reference documents teach or suggest all the claim limitations. MPEP 2143.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites, in part, "...wherein said intermediate documents are hierarchically structured according to a total number of pages contained in each of the intermediate documents..." Thus, claim 1 requires not only that the intermediate documents be structured in a hierarchical manner, but further requires that the hierarchical structure be based on the number of pages in each document.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner concedes, "Nagashima does not specifically teach intermediate contents are hierarchically structured according to the number of pages contained therein." OA, pg. 13. However, the Examiner alleges, "Pekowski teaches information contents are broken down into a number of pages which formatted in form of a tree-structured (see Col. 7 lines 9-16 and 57-64)...." *Id.* The first passage cited by the Examiner to support his positions reads as follows:

... the CPS 12 provides a web-site that makes information and programming stored at the CPS 12 available to the access elements 14, 16 and 18. The access elements 14, 16 and 18 access the CPS files and functionality with the proper communication protocol and the URL of the web-site. As described in more detail below, the information made available by the web-site is broken down into a number of web pages, which comprise formatted, tree-structured information. The information on the web pages may comprise text, images, sounds, animations and other information. Pekowski, col. 7, ln. 7-17.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the first cited passage fails to teach or suggest to someone versed in the art structuring documents hierarchically based on the number of pages in each document. The passage

Serial No: 09/829,623

discusses a website which is "tree-structured". However, it does not itself elaborate on any method by which to structure data hierarchically, saying only that additional details are provided below. Accordingly, Pekowski goes on to state that "[t]he CPS 12 comprises a web server 30 for providing the functionality of the CPS 12 and a database server 32 for storing data for the CPS 12." Pekowski, col. 7, ln. 40-42. This passage suggests that the website is structured according to the structure of the database. This in turn suggests that the additional details of how the website is structured are discussed in the description of the database, as detailed by the second passage cited by the Examiner:

the information stored in the database server 32 may be organized in a hierarchy with shows at the top, followed by divisions in each show, followed by services and accounts in each division. Services may be further subdivided into one or more suppliers for each service, and suppliers may be divided into one or more items for each supplier. Pekowski, col. 7, ln. 57-64.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the second cited passage likewise fails to teach or suggest to someone versed in the art structuring documents hierarchically based on the number of pages in each document. The cited passage makes no mention of organizing the data stored by the database server according to the number of pages in each document. To the contrary, a specific method of organizing the database is detailed, wherein the method is based on criteria other than a number of pages. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that nowhere in Pekowski is there a teaching or suggestion of structuring content hierarchically based on the number of pages in each document.

Claim 1 further recites, in part, "...assigning each of said finite number of intermediate documents an information level based on the number of pages contained therein...." It is emphasized that assigning an information level based on a number of pages is an element of this claim.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner alleges that this claim limitation is taught by Nagashima. The Examiner states that "assigning each of the images a layer in the hierarchy based on the resolution of the image that is proportional with the charges for each of the images (see col. 2 lines 56-60)..." OA, pg. 13. Thus, the Examiner appears to equate assigning images to a layer in the hierarchy based on their resolution with assigning

Serial No: 09/829,623

intermediate documents an information level based on the number of pages contained therein.

In making a *prima facie* case of equivalence, the Examiner should provide an explanation and rationale in the Office action as to why the prior art element is an equivalent. MPEP 2183. The Applicants respectfully submit that no such explanation or rationale is provided in the Office Action.

Furthermore, the Applicants respectfully submit that assigning images to a layer in the hierarchy based on their resolution, as taught by Nagashima, is not equivalent to assigning intermediate documents an information level based on the number of pages contained therein.

The passage cited by the Examiner reads,

According to still another embodiment, the transmission format is a layer in hierarchical encoding.

Since the above-mentioned embodiment has the above technical means, charges of images can be calculated in units of resolutions. Nagashima, col. 2, ln. 56-60.

Nagashima continues to define hierarchical encoding,

First, hierarchical encoding will be briefly described below. Hierarchical encoding is known as an encoding method which can efficiently cope with image processing apparatuses with different resolutions upon encoding image information, and is suitable for retrieving desired images from an image data base.

In the following description, a reduced image that roughly represents the overall image is encoded, and subsequently, difference information used for enlarging the reduced image in turn is encoded. Nagashima, col. 7, ln. 7-15.

The passages above clarify that Nagashima's method of hierarchical encoding specifically concerns the resolution of images. Specifically, Nagashima appears to disclose arranging images according to image resolution, not based on the number of pages contained therein as recited in claim 1.

Nagashima does not teach pagination at all and therefore clearly fails to teach the assigning each of a finite number of intermediate documents an information level based on the number of pages contained in each document. It is further noted that Nagashima does not suggest pagination. One of ordinary skill in the art will appreciate that images are generally displayed in their entirety rather than paginated. As a result, the mention of images

Serial No: 09/829,623

does not teach or suggest pagination. Furthermore, the Applicant submits that nowhere in Nagashima is there a teaching or suggestion of assigning each of a finite number of intermediate documents an information level based on the number of pages contained in each document.

Moreover, obviousness cannot be established by combining prior art to produce the claimed invention absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination. *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1266, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783-84 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by an Examiner not does make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. *Id.*

The Examiner argues, "[i]t would have been obvious...to incorporate the information processing of Pekowski with the system of Nagashima because it would provide for the purpose of displaying information of products or services to potential customers or clients." OA, pg. 13. However, the Office Action has not explained, and it is not evident, why a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to reconstruct Nagashima to provide a method of processing information other than images. The methods, systems and apparatuses disclosed by Nagashima are, as previously demonstrated, specifically designed for image processing. Nagashima does not disclose the processing of textual or other non-image data. Furthermore, Nagashima is specifically designed to process different resolutions of images wherein any available resolution relates to the overall image. This method is different from the method disclosed by Pekowski in which relates to an automated business convention processing system for the entry, processing and tracking of convention-related transactions. Pekowski, col. 1, ln. 37-40. In this light, it is apparent that the only suggestion for combining Nagashima and Pekowski in the manner advanced by the Examiner stems from hindsight knowledge impermissibly derived from the Applicant's disclosure.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not obvious in view of Nagashima and Pekowski and earnestly solicit allowance of the claim.

Serial No: 09/829,623

Claims 2-8

Claims 2-8 are dependent on and further limit claim 1. Since claim 1 is believed allowable, claims 2-8 are also believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Claim 17

Claim 17 recites, "The information providing method according to claim 1, further comprising associating a content price for each of the intermediate documents based on the number of pages contained therein." In rejecting claim 17, the Examiner alleges Pekowski, at column 7, lines 9-16 and 57-64.

Column 7, lines 9-16 of Pekowski states, "The access elements 14, 16 and 18 access the CPS files and functionality with the proper communication protocol and the URL of the web-site. As described in more detail below, the information made available by the web-site is broken down into a number of web pages, which comprise formatted, tree-structured information. The information on the web pages may comprise text, images, sounds, animations and other information."

The Applicants respectfully submit the above citation does not teach or suggest associating a content price for each of the intermediate documents based on the number of pages contained therein.

Column 7, lines 57-64 of Pekowski states, "In accordance with one embodiment, the information stored in the database server 32 may be organized in a hierarchy with shows at the top, followed by divisions in each show, followed by services and accounts in each division. Services may be further subdivided into one or more suppliers for each service, and suppliers may be divided into one or more items for each supplier."

Again, the Applicants respectfully submit the above citation does not teach or suggest associating a content price for each of the intermediate documents based on the number of pages contained therein.

For at least these reasons, and the reasons presented for claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17 is not obvious in view of Nagashima and Pekowski and earnestly solicit allowance of the claim.

Serial No: 09/829,623

Claim 19

Claim 19 recites, "The information providing method according to claim 1, further comprising providing a grammatical description of the amount of information contained in said finite number of intermediate documents."

In rejecting claim 19, the Examiner alleges, "Nagashima teaches providing a description of the amount of information contained in said finite number of intermediate contents (see FIG. 3 and col. 7 lines 59-63.)" OA, pg. 19. The figure cited by the Examiner associates titles and resolutions of images with costs but does not show an amount of information per title. Nagashima, Fig. 3. The passage cited by the Examiner to support this positions reads,

FIG. 3 shows an example of a charge table stored in the storage unit 102. In the charge table shown in FIG. 3, for example, information Info 1 incurs charge 11 when it is provided at resolution 1, incurs charge 12 when it is provided at resolution 2, . . . Nagashima, col. 7, ln. 59-63.

The Applicants respectfully submit that neither the cited passage nor the figure contains any mention of providing a grammatical description of the amount of information contained in a document. Furthermore, neither Nagashima nor Pekowski contains any teaching or suggestion of providing a grammatical description of an amount of information contained in a document.

For at least these reasons, and the reasons presented for claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 is not obvious in view of Nagashima and Pekowski and earnestly solicit allowance of the claim.

Claim 9

Claim 9 recites, in part, "...wherein said intermediate documents are hierarchically structured according to a total number of pages contained in each of the intermediate documents...." Thus, claim 9 requires not only that the intermediate documents be structured in a hierarchical manner, but further requires that the hierarchical structure be based on the number of pages in each document. It is noted that this limitation is similar to a previously discussed limitation of claim 1.

In rejecting claim 9, the Examiner concedes, "Nagashima does not specifically teach intermediate contents are hierarchically structured according to the number of pages contained therein." OA, pg. 14. However, the Examiner alleges that "Pekowski teaches information contents are broken

Serial No: 09/829,623

down into a number of pages which formatted in form of a tree-structured (see Col. 7 lines 9-16 and 57-64)...." *Id.* The Examiner's argument is identical to the argument previously cited by the Examiner in response to a substantially similar element of claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Pekowski fails to teach or suggest to someone versed in the art structuring documents hierarchically according to a total number of pages in each document.

Claim 9 further recites, in part, "...means for assigning each of said finite number of intermediate documents an information level based on the number of pages contained therein..." It is emphasized that assigning a level based on a number of pages is an element of this claim. It is noted that this limitation is similar to a previously discussed limitation of claim 1.

In rejecting claim 9, the Examiner alleges that this claim limitation is taught by Nagashima. The Examiner states that "means for assigning each of the images a layer in the hierarchical based on the resolution of the image that is proportional with the charges for each of the images (see col. 2 lines 56-60)..." OA, pg. 14. The Examiner's argument is identical to the argument previously cited by the Examiner in response to a substantially similar element of claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Nagashima fails to teach or suggest to someone versed in the art structuring documents hierarchically based on the number of pages in each document.

Moreover, obviousness cannot be established by combining prior art to produce the claimed invention absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination. *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1266, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783-84 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by an Examiner not does make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. *Id.*

The Examiner argues, "[i]t would have been obvious...to incorporate the information processing of Pekowski with the system of Nagashima because it would provide for the purpose of displaying information of products or services to potential customers or clients." OA, pg. 14. The Examiner's argument is identical to the argument previously cited by the Examiner in response to claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the

Serial No: 09/829,623

only suggestion for combining Nagashima and Pekowski in the manner advanced by the Examiner stems from hindsight knowledge impermissibly derived from the Applicant's disclosure.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 is not obvious in view of Nagashima and Pekowski and earnestly solicit allowance of the claim.

Claims 10-16

Claims 10-16 are dependent on and further limit claim 9. Since claim 9 is believed allowable, claims 10-16 are also believed allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 9.

Claim 18

Claim 18 recites, "The information providing apparatus according to claim 9, further comprising a price storage unit configured to associate a content price for each of the intermediate documents based on the number of pages contained therein." In rejecting claim 18, the Examiner alleges Pekowski, at column 7, lines 9-16 and 57-64.

Column 7, lines 9-16 of Pekowski states, "The access elements 14, 16 and 18 access the CPS files and functionality with the proper communication protocol and the URL of the web-site. As described in more detail below, the information made available by the web-site is broken down into a number of web pages, which comprise formatted, tree-structured information. The information on the web pages may comprise text, images, sounds, animations and other information."

The Applicants respectfully submit the above citation does not teach or suggest associating a content price for each of the intermediate documents based on the number of pages contained therein.

Column 7, lines 57-64 of Pekowski states, "In accordance with one embodiment, the information stored in the database server 32 may be organized in a hierarchy with shows at the top, followed by divisions in each show, followed by services and accounts in each division. Services may be further subdivided into one or more suppliers for each service, and suppliers may be divided into one or more items for each supplier."

Serial No: 09/829,623

Again, the Applicants respectfully submit the above citation does not teach or suggest associating a content price for each of the intermediate documents based on the number of pages contained therein.

For at least these reasons, and the reasons presented for claim 9, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 18 is not obvious in view of Nagashima and Pekowski and earnestly solicit allowance of the claim.

Claim 21

Claim 21 recites, "The information providing apparatus according to claim 9, further comprising means for providing a grammatical description of the amount of information contained in said finite number of intermediate documents." It is noted that this limitation is similar to a previously discussed limitation of claim 19.

In rejecting claim 21, the Examiner alleges, "Nagashima teaches providing a description of the amount of information contained in said finite number of intermediate contents (see FIG. 3 and col. 7 lines 59-63.)" OA, pg. 19. The Examiner's argument is identical to the argument previously cited by the Examiner in response to a substantially similar element of claim 19.

The Applicants respectfully submit that, as previously discussed in regards to claim 19, neither the cited passage nor the figure contains any mention of providing a grammatical description of the amount of information contained in a document. Furthermore, neither Nagashima nor Pekowski contains any teaching or suggestion of providing a grammatical description of an amount of information contained in a document.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 21 is not obvious in view of Nagashima and Pekowski and earnestly solicit allowance of the claim.

Claim 23

Claim 23 recites, in part, "...wherein said intermediate documents are hierarchically structured according to a total number of pages contained in each of the intermediate documents...." Thus, claim 23 requires not only that the intermediate documents be structured in a hierarchical manner, but further requires that the hierarchical structure be based on the number of

Serial No: 09/829,623

pages in each document. It is noted that this limitation is identical to a previously discussed limitation of claim 1.

In rejecting claim 23, the Examiner concedes, "Nagashima does not specifically teach intermediate contents are hierarchically structured according to the number of pages contained therein." OA, pg. 15. However, the Examiner alleges that "Pekowski teaches information contents are broken down into a number of pages which formatted in form of a tree-structured (see Col. 7 lines 9-16 and 57-64)..." *Id.* The Examiner's argument is identical to the argument previously cited by the Examiner in response to an identical element of claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Pekowski fails to teach or suggest to someone versed in the art structuring documents hierarchically according to a total number of pages in each document.

Claim 23 further recites, in part, "...assign each of said finite number of intermediate documents an information level based on the number of pages contained therein..." It is emphasized that assigning a level based on a number of pages is an element of this claim. It is noted that this limitation is similar to a previously discussed limitation of claim 1.

In rejecting claim 23, the Examiner alleges that this claim limitation is taught by Nagashima. The Examiner states, "assigning each of the images a layer in the hierarchical based on the resolution of the image that is proportional with the charges for each of the images (see col. 2 lines 56-60)...." OA, pg. 15. The Examiner's argument is substantially similar to the argument previously cited by the Examiner in response to a substantially similar element of claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Nagashima fails to teach or suggest to someone versed in the art structuring documents hierarchically based on the number of pages in each document.

Moreover, obviousness cannot be established by combining prior art to produce the claimed invention absent some teaching or suggestion supporting the combination. *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1266, 23 USPQ2d 1780, 1783-84 (Fed. Cir. 1992). The mere fact that the prior art may be modified in the manner suggested by an Examiner not does make the modification obvious unless the prior art suggested the desirability of the modification. *Id.*

Serial No: 09/829,623

The Examiner argues, "[i]t would have been obvious...to incorporate the information processing of Pekowski with the system of Nagashima because it would provide for the purpose of displaying information of products or services to potential customers or clients." OA, pg. 15. The Examiner's argument is identical to the argument previously cited by the Examiner in response to claim 1. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the only suggestion for combining Nagashima and Pekowski in the manner advanced by the Examiner stems from hindsight knowledge impermissibly derived from the Applicant's disclosure.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 23 is not obvious in view of Nagashima and Pekowski and earnestly solicit allowance of the claim.

Claim 24

Claim 24 recites, "The computer program product according to claim 23, further comprising program codes configured to cause the program to provide a description of the amount of information contained in said finite number of intermediate documents." It is noted that this limitation is similar to a previously discussed limitation of claim 19.

In rejecting claim 24, the Examiner alleges, "Nagashima teaches providing a description of the amount of information contained in said finite number of intermediate contents (see FIG. 3 and col. 7 lines 59-63.)" OA, pg. 19. The Examiner's argument is identical to the argument previously cited by the Examiner in response to a substantially similar element of claim 19.

The Applicants respectfully submit that, as previously discussed in regards to claim 19, neither the cited passage nor the figure contains any mention of providing a description of the amount of information contained in a document. Furthermore, neither Nagashima nor Pekowski contains any teaching or suggestion of providing a description of an amount of information contained in a document.

For at least these reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 24 is not obvious in view of Nagashima and Pekowski and earnestly solicit allowance of the claim.

Serial No: 09/829,623

Claim 25

Claim 25 recites, "The computer program product according to claim 23, further comprising program codes configured to cause the program to associate a content price for each of the intermediate documents based on the number of pages contained therein." In rejecting claim 25, the Examiner alleges Pekowski, at column 7, lines 9-16 and 57-64.

Column 7, lines 9-16 of Pekowski states, "The access elements 14, 16 and 18 access the CPS files and functionality with the proper communication protocol and the URL of the web-site. As described in more detail below, the information made available by the web-site is broken down into a number of web pages, which comprise formatted, tree-structured information. The information on the web pages may comprise text, images, sounds, animations and other information."

The Applicants respectfully submit the above citation does not teach or suggest associating a content price for each of the intermediate documents based on the number of pages contained therein.

Column 7, lines 57-64 of Pekowski states, "In accordance with one embodiment, the information stored in the database server 32 may be organized in a hierarchy with shows at the top, followed by divisions in each show, followed by services and accounts in each division. Services may be further subdivided into one or more suppliers for each service, and suppliers may be divided into one or more items for each supplier."

Again, the Applicants respectfully submit the above citation does not teach or suggest associating a content price for each of the intermediate documents based on the number of pages contained therein.

For at least these reasons, and the reasons presented for claim 23, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 25 is not obvious in view of Nagashima and Pekowski and earnestly solicit allowance of the claim.

NEW CLAIMS:

Claim 26

Claim 26 is added and recites, "The information providing method according to claim 1, wherein the entire body of information includes text information." This claim further limits claim 1 to specify that the entire body of information includes text information.

Serial No: 09/829,623

The addition of Claim 26 does not add any additional information to the specification, and support for Claim 26 exists within the specification. For instance, the Application states, "The content may include multiple types of information. For example, document information, such as image information or text information, and control information, such as command and linking information, may coexist." App., para. 0016. As another example, the Application states, "For example, the type of text data or word processor data used for character code or an image data type may be requested." App., para. 0078.

It is believed that Claim 26 is not taught by the cited art since the method disclosed by Nagashima specifically relates to image data. For at least this reason, and the reasons given for claim 1, claim 26 is believed allowable over the cited art.

Claim 27

Claim 27 is added and recites, "The information providing apparatus according to claim 9, wherein the entire body of information includes text information." This claim further limits claim 9 to specify that the entire body of information includes text-based information.

The addition of Claim 27 does not add any additional information to the specification. Support for Claim 27 exists within the specification (see discussion above for Claim 26).

It is believed that Claim 27 is not taught by the cited art since the method disclosed by Nagashima specifically relates to image data. For at least this reason, and the reasons given for claim 9, claim 27 is believed allowable over the cited art.

Claim 28

Claim 28 is added and recites, "The computer program product according to claim 23, wherein the entire body of information includes text information." This claim further limits claim 23 to specify that the entire body of information includes text-based information.

The addition of Claim 28 does not add any additional information to the specification. Support for Claim 28 exists within the specification (see discussion above for Claim 26).

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Serial No: 09/829,623

JUL 10 2006

It is believed that Claim 28 is not taught by the cited art since the method disclosed by Nagashima specifically relates to image data. For at least this reason, and the reasons given for claim 23, claim 28 is believed allowable over the cited art.


CONCLUSION

In view of the forgoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that this case is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. If any points remain at issue that the Examiner feels could best be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to contact the attorney below.

Please charge Deposit Account 50-0510 the amount of \$150 for three additional dependent claim, and \$120 for a one-month extension for the period for response to the Office Action. No other fee is believed due with this Amendment, however, should a fee be required please charge Deposit Account 50-0510. Should any extensions of time be required, please consider this a petition thereof and charge Deposit Account 50-0510 the required fee.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 10, 2006


Ido Tuchman, Reg. No. 45,924
Law Office of Ido Tuchman
82-70 Beverly Road
Kew Gardens, NY 11415
Telephone (718) 544-1110
Facsimile (718) 544-8588